	Case 2:07-cv-00954-RSM Documer	nt 24	Filed 10/12/07	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE			
9	MILO D. BURROUGHS,			
10	Plaintiff,	C	ASE NO. C07-95	APSM
11	V.		ASE NO. C07-73	HIGWI
12	MARY E. PETERS, Secretary of Department	ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION		
13	of Transportation,			
14	Defendant.			
15 16	This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's Request for Clarification. (Dkt. #23).			
17	Plaintiff, appearing pro se, seeks clarification on whether this Court granted summary judgment			
18	in favor of defendant or St. Martin's University ("St. Martin's"). Plaintiff argues that because			
19	St. Martin's supported defendant's motion for summary judgment through declarations, St.			
20	Martin's became a party to this action. (Dkt. #23 at p. 1). Plaintiff also indicates that			
21	"[r]etaliation is [St. Martin's] only reason for involving themselves in this matter." <i>Id.</i>			
22	However, a university does not become a party simply by filing declarations in support of a			
23	summary judgment motion. Consequently, at no time in this litigation did St. Martin's become a			
24	party pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 20. Therefore the Court hereby ORDERS:			
25	(1) Plaintiff's Request for Clarification is GRANTED. The Court dismissed plaintiff's			
26	claims with respect to the defendant plaintiff named in his complaint. St. Martin's is not a party			
27	ODDED			
28	ORDER PAGE - 1			

to this action and therefore it would be a legal impossibility for this Court to grant summary judgment in favor of St. Martin's. This case remains CLOSED. (2) The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Order to the pro se plaintiff and all counsel of record. DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2007. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE PAGE - 2